DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 257 SP 020 402

AUTHOR Brophy, Jere
TITLE Classroom Organization and Management.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO IRT-OP-54
PUB DATE May 82
CONTRACT 400-81-0014
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at a Conference sponsored by the National Institute of Education (Warrenton, VA, February, 1982).
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 ($4.50).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Modification; Class Organization; Classroom Design; *Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Discipline; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Role; Time on Task

ABSTRACT

The major emphasis in the studies considered in this paper is on the role of the teacher as a professional with particular expertise and specific but limited responsibilities to students and parents, and with certain rights as the instructional leader and authority figure in the classroom. According to research studies, a comprehensive approach to classroom management would include: (1) attention to student characteristics and individual differences; (2) preparation of the classroom as an effective learning environment; (3) organization of instruction and support activities to maximize student engagement in productive tasks; (4) development of a workable set of housekeeping procedures and behavior rules; (5) techniques for group management during active instruction and motivating and shaping desired behavior; (6) techniques for conflict resolution and dealing with students' personal adjustment problems; and (7) orchestration of all these elements into an internally consistent and effective system. Recent research on these elements are cited and discussed in the context of a well-organized and well-managed classroom and the distinguishing differences between effective and ineffective teachers. Brief reviews are given of studies on effective techniques for establishing order and control at the beginning of the school year, supplemental group management techniques, and behavior modification techniques. The findings and suggestions arising from current research on counseling and therapy are also reviewed and discussed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218257

Occasional Paper No. 54

CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Jere Brophy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jere Brophy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Published By

The Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

May 1982

SP 020 402

Publication of this work is sponsored by the Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded primarily by the Program for Teaching and Instruction of the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. 400-81-0014)

Institute for Research on Teaching

Teachers' thoughts and decisions are the focus of studies currently under way at Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). The IRT was founded in April 1976 with a $3.6 million grant from the National Institute of Education. A new grant obtained in 1981 from the NIE extends the IRT's work through 1984. Funding is also received from other agencies and foundations. The Institute has major projects investigating teacher decision-making, including studies of reading diagnosis and remediation, classroom management strategies, instruction in the areas of language arts, reading, and mathematics, teacher education, teacher planning, effects of external pressures on teachers' decisions, socio-cultural factors, and teachers' perceptions of student affect. Researchers from many different disciplines cooperate in IRT research. In addition, public school teachers work at IRT as half-time collaborators in research, helping to design and plan studies, collect data, and analyze results. The Institute publishes research reports, conference proceedings, occasional papers, and a free quarterly newsletter for practitioners. For more information or to be placed on the IRT mailing list please write to:: The IRT Editor, 252 Erickson, MSU, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

Co-Directors: Jere E. Brophy and Andrew C. Porter

Associate Directors: Judith E. Lanier and Lee S. Shulman

Editorial Staff:

Janet Flegg, IRT editor
Pat Nischan, assistant editor

Abstract

Recent theory and research on classroom management are reviewed. Topics include: the well organized classroom and the group management techniques that sustain it; getting the year off to a good start; group relationships; behavior modification techniques; individual counseling and psychotherapy-based techniques; and context differences affecting what constitutes appropriate classroom management and how to achieve it. It is concluded that no single approach is sufficient, but that a comprehensive and increasingly empirically supported eclectic approach to classroom management can be developed by combining different but compatible elements into an integrated system.

CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT[1]

Jere Brophy[2]

Despite its recognized importance, there has been little systematic research on the topic of classroom management until the last 10-15 years. Teachers seeking advice on how to organize and manage their classrooms had to rely on psychological theories developed outside classroom settings or on the "bag of tricks" suggestions of individual teachers. Unfortunately, many of the theory-based ideas were incorrect or impractical for classroom use, and the experience-based advice was unsystematic and often contradictory. As a result, teachers were often left with the impression that classroom management is purely an art rather than partly an applied science, and that "you have to find out what works best for you!"

Classroom research conducted in the last 10-15 years has improved this situation dramatically. Research by several teams of investigators has developed clear and detailed information about how successful teachers organize and manage their classrooms, including information about how they get off to a good start at the beginning of the year. If learned and applied systematically, the princi-

---

[1]This paper was prepared for presentation at a conference on the implications of research on teaching for practice. The conference was sponsored by the National Institute of Education and held at Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, February 1982.

[2]Jere Brophy is a senior researcher at the IRT, coordinator of the Classroom Strategy project, and a professor of counseling and educational psychology.

ples to be discussed here will enable teachers to establish their classrooms as effective learning environments and to prevent or successfully cope with most of the conduct problems that students present. There is less classroom research available on methods of handling students with chronic problems who require more intensive or individualized treatment, but even here, more information is becoming available and there is a growing consensus about which problem-solving strategies are both practical and effective for use by teachers.

Prior to discussion of the principles themselves, I will mention a few of the assumptions underlying the perspective on effective classroom organization and management taken in this paper. One is that the teacher is both the authority figure and the instructional leader in the classroom. Students can be invited to share in decision making about what and how to learn and about appropriate classroom conduct, but the teacher retains ultimate authority and responsibility. This assumption conflicts with the views of certain radical critics of education, but it matches the perceptions of most school administrators, teachers, and parents. Furthermore, recent research (Metz, 1978; Nash, 1976) indicates that it matches the views of students, as well.

A second basic assumption is that good classroom management implies good instruction, and vice versa. Recent research makes it very clear that successful classroom management involves not merely responding effectively when problems occur but preventing problems from occurring very frequently at all. In turn, this prevention is accomplished primarily by good planning, curriculum pacing,

and instruction that keeps students profitably engaged in appropriate academic activities. Furthermore, instruction is involved in much of the activity that would ordinarily be described as classroom management, as when teachers provide their students with instruction in and opportunities to practice the procedures to be used during everyday classroom routines. We can discuss classroom management apart from instruction in the formal curriculum, but in practice these two key teaching tasks are interdependent. Because successful classroom managers maximize the time that their students spend engaged in academic tasks, they also maximize their students' opportunities to learn academic content, and this shows up in superior performance on achievement tests (Brophy, 1979; Fisher, Berliner, Filby, Marliave, Cohen, & Dishaw, 1980; Good, 1979; Rosenshine & Berliner, 1978).

A third assumption built into the perspective taken in this paper is that optimal classroom organization and management strategies are not merely effective, but cost/effective. Consequently, there will be little consideration of approaches that are unfeasible for most teachers (token economies, extended psychotherapy approaches) or likely to engender undesirable side effects (certain authoritarian or punitive approaches).

The Well-Organized and Well-Managed Classroom

Let us begin with the look and feel of a classroom that is functioning efficiently as a successful learning environment. First, it reveals organization, planning, and scheduling. The room is divided into distinct areas furnished and equipped for specific activities. Equipment that must be stored can be removed and replaced easily, and each item has its own place. Traffic patterns

facilitate movement around the room, and minimize crowding or bumping. Transitions between activities are accomplished efficiently following a brief signal or a few directions from the teacher and the students seem to know where they are supposed to be, what they are supposed to be doing, and what equipment they will need (Arlin, 1979).

The students appear attentive to the teacher's presentations and responsive to questions. Lessons, recitations, and other group activities move along at a brisk pace, although they are structured so that subparts are discernible and separated by clear transitions. When students are released to work on their own, they seem to know what to do and to settle quickly into doing it. Usually, they continue the activity through to completion without difficulty, and then turn to some new approved activity. If they do need help they can get it from the teacher or some other source, and thus can quickly resume their work. To an untrained observer, the classroom seems to work automatically, without much teacher effort devoted to classroom management. Classroom research has established, however, that such well-functioning classrooms do not just happen. Instead, they result from consistent teacher efforts to create, maintain, and (occasionally) restore conditions that foster effective learning.

Kounin (1970) and his colleagues first showed this conclusively in a videotaped study of two types of classrooms. The first type included the smooth functioning classrooms described in the previous paragraph. In contrast, teachers in the comparison classrooms were fighting to keep the lid on. Activities suffered from

poor attention and frequent disruption. Transitions were lengthy and often chaotic. Much of the teachers' time was spent dealing with student misconduct.

Kounin and his colleagues began by analyzing the videotapes from these classrooms in detail, concentrating on teachers' methods of dealing with student misconduct and disruption. Given the great differences in classroom management success displayed by these two groups of teachers, the researchers expected to see large and systematic differences in methods of dealing with student misconduct. To their surprise, they found no systematic differences at all! Good classroom managers were not notably different from poor classroom managers when responding to student misconduct.

Distinguishing Effective from Ineffective Teachers

Fortunately, the researchers did not stop at this point. In the process of discovering that the two groups of teachers did not differ much in their responses to disruptive students, they noted that the teachers differed in other ways. In particular, the effective classroom managers systematically did things to minimize the frequency with which students became disruptive in the first place. Some of these teacher behaviors are as follows.

With-itness. Effective managers nipped problems in the bud before they could escalate into disruption. They were able to do this because they monitored the classroom regularly, stationing themselves where they could see all of the students and scan all parts of the classroom continuously. This and related behaviors let students know that their teachers were "with-it"--aware of what was happening at all times and likely to detect inappropriate behavior early and accurately.

Overlappingness. Effective managers also had learned to do more than one thing at a time when necessary. When conferring with an individual pupil, for example, they would continue to monitor events going on in the rest of the classroom. When teaching reading groups, they would deal with students from outside the group who came to ask questions, but in ways that did not involve disrupting the reading group. In general, they handled routine housekeeping tasks and met individual needs without disrupting the ongoing activities of the class as a whole.

Signal continuity and momentum in lessons. When teaching the whole class or a small group, effective managers were well prepared and thus able to move through the activity at a brisk pace. There were few interruptions due to failure to bring or prepare a prop, confusion about what to do next, the need to stop and consult the teacher's manual, false starts, or backtracking to present information that should have been presented earlier. Minor, fleeting inattention was ignored. More serious inattention was dealt with before it escalated into disruption, but in ways that were not themselves disruptive. Thus, these teachers would move near to the inattentive students, use eye contact where possible, direct a question or comment to them, or cue their attention with a brief comment. They would not, however, interrupt the lesson unnecessarily by delivering extended reprimands or other overreactions that would focus everyone's attention on the inattentive students rather than the lesson content. In general, these methods were effective because students tend to be attentive (and their inattention tends to be fleeting) when they are presented with a continuous academic

"signal" to attend to. Problems tend to set in when they have no clear "signal" to attend to nor task to focus on, and these problems will multiply in frequency and escalate in intensity the longer the students are left without such a focus.

Group alerting and accountability in lessons. In addition to conducting smooth, briskly paced lessons which provided students with a continuous signal on which to focus attention, effective classroom managers used presentation and questioning techniques designed to keep the group alert and accountable. These included looking around the group before calling on someone to recite, keeping the students in suspense as to whom would be called on next by selecting randomly, getting around to everyone frequently, interspersing choral responses with individual responses, asking for volunteers to raise their hands, throwing out challenges by declaring that the next question would be difficult or tricky, calling on listeners to comment upon or correct a response, and presenting novel or interesting material. The idea here is to keep students attentive to presentations because something new or exciting could happen at any time, and to keep them accountable for learning the content by making them aware that they might be called upon at any time.

Variety and challenge in seatwork. Kounin was one of the first to recognize that students spend much (often a majority) of their classroom time working independently rather than under the direct supervision of the teacher, and that the appropriateness and interest value of the assigned work will influence the quality of task engagement during these times. Ideal seatwork is selected to be

at the right level of difficulty (easy enough to allow successful completion but difficult or different enough from previous work to provide a degree of challenge to each student), and within this, to include enough variety to stimulate student interest.

Subsequent research has supported most of Kounin's recommendations. In a correlational study at the second and third grade level (Brophy & Evertson, 1976), and in an experimental study of instruction in first grade reading groups (Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979), indicators of with-itness, overlappingness, and smoothness of lesson pacing and transitions were associated both with better group management and with better student learning. However, these studies did not support some of the group alerting and accountability techniques, especially the notion of being random and unpredictable in calling on students to recite. Good and Grouws (1977), in a study of fourth grade mathematics instruction, found that group alerting was positively related to student learning but accountability was related curvilinearly (teachers who used a moderate amount were more successful than those who had too much or too little). These various findings are all compatible with the interpretation that group alerting and accountability devices are appropriate for occasional use within classroom management contexts established by the apparently more fundamental and important variables of with-itness, overlappingness, signal continuity and momentum in lessons, and variety and appropriate level of challenge in seatwork activities. Group alerting and accountability devices do stimulate student attention in the short run, but if they have to be used too often, it is likely that the teacher is failing to implement some of the more fundamental classroom management strategies sufficiently.

Recent research on teacher effectiveness in producing student learning gains also suggests a cautionary note about the appropriate level of challenge in seatwork assignments. This work suggests that learning proceeds most efficiently when students enjoy very high rates of success in completing tasks correctly (that is, where the tasks are easy for them to do). Where the teacher is present to monitor responses and provide immediate feedback (such as during recitations), success rates of at least 70-80% should be expected (Brophy & Evertson, 1976). Where students are expected to work on their own, however, success rates of 95 - 100% will be necessary (Fisher, et. al., 1980). This point deserves elaboration, because to many obervers, a 95% success rate seems too high, suggesting a lack of challenge. Bear in mind that we are talking about independent seatwork and homework assignments that students must be able to progress through on their own, and that these assignments demand application of hierarchically organized knowledge and skills that must be not merely learned but mastered to the point of overlearning if they are going to be retained and applied to still more complex material. Confusion about what to do or lack of even a single important concept or skill will frustrate students' progress, and lead to both management and instructional problems for teachers. Yet, this happens frequently. Observational study suggests that, to the extent that students are given inappropriate tasks, the tasks are much more likely to be too difficult than too easy (Fisher, et. al., 1980; Gambrell, Wilson, & Gantt, 1981; Jorgenson, 1977). Thus, although variety

and other features that enhance the interest value of tasks should be considered, and although students should not be burdened with busy work that involves no challenge at all, teachers should insure that whatever new or more difficult challenges may be involved in seatwork tasks can be assimilated by the students (i.e., the students can complete the tasks with a high rate of success). This will require differentiated assignments in many classrooms, at least in certain subjects.

Getting Off To A Good Start

Kounin's work established that the key to the well functioning classroom is maintaining a continuous academic focus for student attention and engagement, and avoiding "downtime" when students have nothing to do or are not sure about what they are supposed to be doing. His work also identified some of the key teacher behaviors involved in maintaining the classroom as an efficient learning environment on an everyday basis. He did not, however, deal with a question of great practical importance to teachers: How does one establish a well-managed classroom at the beginning of the year?

Brophy and Putnam (1979) and Good and Brophy (1978, 1980) suggested that the process begins with advanced preparation and planning done before the school year begins. Given the types of students and academic activities anticipated, what is the most efficient use of the available space? How should the furnishings be grouped and the equipment placed? Thought devoted to these questions when preparing the classroom for use by the students may maximize the

degree to which students get the intended benefit from the equipment and activities (Nash, 1981).

Consideration of traffic patterns can make for smoother transitions later, and thoughtful equipment storage can minimize bottlenecks and lines. Consideration of student convenience in planning storage space can maximize the degree to which students can handle their personal belongings and school supplies on their own, thus minimizing their need to get instructions or help from the teacher. Thought devoted to appropriate procedures and routines for handling paper flow and other daily classroom business will produce clarity about procedures that will help students to know exactly what to do (and again, will maximize the degree to which they can handle things themselves without needing help or directions from the teacher).

These speculations based on Kounin's work have been validated and elaborated in great detail by Evertson, Emmer, Anderson, and their colleagues at the the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin. In the first of a series of studies, these investigators intensively observed 28 third-grade teachers, visiting their classrooms frequently during the first few weeks of school and occasionally thereafter (Anderson, Evertson, & Emmer, 1980; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980). Observers took detailed notes about the rules and procedures that teachers introduced to their students, their methods of doing so, and their methods of following up when it became necessary to employ the procedures or enforce the rules. In addition, every 15 minutes during each observation they scanned the classroom and

recorded information on the percentage of students who were engaged in lessons, academic tasks, or other activities approved by the teacher. These student engagement data and other information from the observers' descriptions of the classroom were later used to identify successful and unsuccessful classroom managers.

This study made it clear that the seemingly automatic smooth-functioning that was observable throughout most of the school year in the classrooms of successful managers results from a great deal of preparation and organization at the beginning of the year. Successful managers spent a great deal of classroom time in the early weeks introducing rules and procedures. Room arrangement, materials storage, and other physical aspects had been prepared in advance. On the first day and throughout the first week, special attention was given to matters of greatest concern to the students (such as information about the teacher and their classmates, review of the daily schedule, description of times and practices for lunch and recess, where to put personal materials, access to the lavatory, when and where to get a drink). Classroom routines were introduced gradually as needed, without overloading students with too much information at one time.

Implementing classroom rules and procedures was more a matter of instruction than "control," although it was important for the teachers to follow through on their stated expectations. Effective managers not only told their students what they expected them to do, but personally modeled the correct procedures for them, took time to answer questions and resolve ambiguities, and, where

necessary, allowed time for practice of the procedures with feedback as needed. In short, key procedures and routines were taught to the students during more or less formal lessons, just as academic content is taught.

In addition, effective managers were thorough in following up on their expectations. They reminded students of key aspects of procedures shortly before they were to carry them out, and they scheduled additional instruction and practice when procedures were not carried out properly. The students were monitored carefully and not "turned loose" without careful direction. Consequences of appropriate and inappropriate behavior were clearer than in other classrooms, and were applied more consistently. Inappropriate behavior was stopped more quickly. In general, the more effective managers showed more of three major clusters of behavior.

Behaviors that Conveyed Purposefulness

Students were held accountable for completing work on time (although the teachers taught them to pace themselves using the clock). Regular times were scheduled each day to quickly review independent work (so that difficulties could be identified and follow-up assistance could be offered quickly). The teachers regularly circulated through the room during seatwork, checking on each student's progress. Completed papers were returned to students as soon as possible, with feedback. In general, effective managers showed concern about maximizing the time available for instruction, and about seeing that their students learned the content (and not just that they remained quiet).

Behaviors that Taught Students How to Behave Appropriately

Effective managers were clear about what they expected and what they would not tolerate. In particular, they focused on what students should be doing, and on teaching them how to do it when necessary. This included the "don'ts" involved in keeping order and reasonable quiet in the classroom, but it stressed behaviors that were more prescriptive and learning-related, such as how to read and follow directions for independent work. Responses to failure to follow these procedures properly stressed specific corrective feedback rather than criticism or threat of punishment. In general, the stress was on teaching (presumably willing) students what to do and how to do it, rather than on manipulating (presumably unwilling) students through reward and punishment.

Teacher Skills in Diagnosing Students' Focus of Attention

Effective managers were sensitive to student concerns and continually monitored their students for signs of confusion or inattention. They arranged desks so that students could easily face the point in the room where they most often focused attention. They used variations in voice, movement, and pacing to refocus attention during lessons. Daily activities were scheduled to coincide with changes in students' readiness to attend versus needs for physical activity. Activities had clear beginnings and endings, with efficient transitions in between. In general, the teachers required active attention of all students when important information was being given.

Even after these early weeks of the school year, effective

managers were consistent in maintaining desired routines. They devoted less time to procedural instruction and practice, but they continued to give reminders and remedial instruction when necessary, and they remained consistent in enforcing their expectations.

Follow-up work at the junior high school level (Sanford & Evertson, 1981; Emmer & Evertson, Note 1) revealed similar differences between effective and ineffective classroom managers, although the junior high school teachers did not need to put as much emphasis on rules and procedures, especially on teaching the students how to follow them. It was especially important, however, for junior high school teachers to communicate their expectations clearly, monitor their students for compliance, and maintain student responsibility for engaging in and completing work assignments (see also Moscowitz & Hayman, 1976).

More recently, this research team has followed up their observational studies with intervention studies, in which teachers are trained in effective classroom management techniques, using extremely detailed manuals based on their earlier work. These intervention studies have been successful in improving teachers' classroom management skills, and consequently, students' task engagement rates. As intervention studies are completed, the training manuals are revised and then made available at cost to teachers and teacher educators. The junior high manual is still under revision, but the elementary manual is already available (Evertson, Emmer, Clements, Sanford, Worsham, & Williams, Note 2).

Supplemental Group Management Techniques

The classroom organization and management techniques identified by Kounin and his colleagues and by Evertson, Emmer, Anderson, and their colleagues complement one another and, taken together, appear to be both necessary and sufficient for establishing the classroom as an effective learning environment. It is clear from this research that the key to effective classroom management is prevention: Effective classroom managers are distinguished by their success in preventing problems from arising in the first place, rather than by special skills for dealing with problems once they occur. It is also clear that their success is not achieved through a few isolated techniques or gimmicks, but instead is the result of a systematic approach to classroom management which starts with advanced preparation and planning before the school year begins, is implemented initially through systematic communication of expectations and establishment of procedures and routines at the beginning of the year, and is maintained throughout the year, not only by consistency following up on stated expectations, but by presenting the students with a continuous stream of well chosen and well prepared academic activities that focus their attention during group lessons and engage their concentrated efforts during independent work times.

Such a thorough and integrated approach to classroom management, if implemented continuously and linked with similarly thorough and effective instruction, will enable teachers to prevent most

problems from occurring in the first place and to handle those that do occur with brief, non-disruptive techniques. This approach appears to be both necessary (less intensive or systematic efforts are unlikely to succeed) and sufficient (the teacher establishes the classroom as an effective learning environment without requiring more intensive or cumbersome techniques such as token economies). Yet, some students with intensive personal or behavioral problems will require individualized treatment in addition to (not instead of) the group management techniques described above, and many teachers will want to pursue broader student socialization goals beyond establishing the classroom as an effective learning environment (developing good group dynamics, promoting individuals' mental health and personal adjustment, etc.). Additional techniques beyond those already described can and should be used for these purposes, although it should be recognized that they are supplements to, and not substitutes for, the set of basic techniques already described.

Group Relationships

Recent research has produced a great deal of information useful to teachers that are concerned about establishing good interpersonal relationships and group dynamics in their classrooms, including information about how to overcome the social barriers that are often associated with differences in sex, race, social class, or achievement level. This research makes it clear that merely bringing antagonistic or voluntarily segregated groups together for frequent contact will not by itself promote prosocial, integrated activities (in fact, it may even increase the level of group conflict).

Prosocial outcomes can be expected, however, when students from different groups are not merely brought together but involved in cooperative activities, especially interdependent activities that require the active participation of all group members to insure successful accomplishment of the group mission (Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Sikes, & Snapp, 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1975; Sharan, 1980; Slavin, 1980).

An example is the Jigsaw approach (Aronson, et al., 1978), in which group activities are arranged so that each member of the group possesses at least one key item of unique information that is essential to the group's success. This requires the brighter and more assertive students who might ordinarily dominate group interaction to the exclusion of their peers (Webb, 1980) to encourage the active participation of everyone, and to value everyone's contribution. It also encourages the slower and more reticent students, who might otherwise contribute little or nothing, to participate actively in group activities and consider themselves as true group members and important contributors.

The Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT) approach accomplishes similar goals in a different way (Slavin, 1980). Here, students are divided into teams (in which members vary in sex, race, achievement level, etc.), which compete for prizes awarded for academic excellence. In addition to working together as a team on whatever cooperative activities may be included in the program, team members contribute to their teams' point totals through their performance on seatwork and other independent activities. Each team member

contributes roughly equally to the team's relative success, because points are awarded according to a handicapping system in which performance standards are based on each individual's previous levels of success. Thus, low achievers who succeed in meeting the performance standards assigned to them contribute as much to their team's total score as high achievers who succeed in meeting the performance standards assigned to them. This approach has been shown to improve the quantity and quality of contact among team members inside and outside of the classroom, and it sometimes leads to improved achievement in addition to improved interpersonal relationships (Slavin, 1980).

Other approaches, in which group members cooperate to pursue common goals, have been successful in promoting good group dynamics (see Stanford, 1977, regarding the formation and development of classroom groups) and approaches that allow individuals to display unique knowledge or skills, have been successful in enhancing the social status or peer acceptance of the individuals involved. In general, successful techniques have in common the fact that they do not merely bring together individuals who do not often interact, but bring them together in ways that require them to cooperate prosocially or allow them to see positive attributes in one another that they might not have become aware of otherwise. In addition to these group-based approaches, there are a variety of social-skills training approaches that teachers can use to help socially isolated or rejected students to acquire such skills as initiating interactions with their peers, reinforcing prosocial contact, and the

like (Cartledge and Milburn, 1978).

Behavior Modification Techniques

Techniques of behavior analysis and behavior modification are often recommended to teachers based on social learning theory: Reward desirable behavior and extinguish (by ignoring) undesirable behavior, or if necessary, punish undesirable behavior (O'Leary & O'Leary, 1977; Krumboltz & Krumboltz, 1972). Early applications were mostly limited to the shaping of the behaviors (such as staying in the seat or remaining quiet) of individual students through material or social reinforcement. Since then, systems have been developed for use with the class as a whole (Thompson, Brassell, Persons, Tucker, & Rollins, 1974), there has been a shift of emphasis from inhibiting misconduct to rewarding good academic performance (Kazdin, 1977) and from controlling students externally to teaching them to learn to control themselves (Meichenbaum, 1977; McLaughlin, 1976), and techniques have proliferated. Procedures for increasing desired behavior include praise and approval, modeling, token reinforcement programs, programmed instruction, self-specification of contingencies, self-reinforcement, establishment of clear rules and directions, and shaping. Procedures for decreasing undesirable behavior include extinction, reinforcing incompatible behaviors, self-reprimands, time out from reinforcement, relaxation (for fears and anxiety), response cost (punishment by removal of reinforcers), medication, self-instruction, and self-evaluation. The breadth of this list indicates the practical orientation of contemporary behavior

modifiers, as well as the degree to which they have embraced techniques that originated elsewhere and that have little or nothing to do with social learning theory or reinforcement.

Most of the early, reinforcement-oriented behavior modification approaches proved impractical for most teachers. For example, the financial and time costs involved in implementing token economy systems make these approaches unacceptable to most teachers, although token economies have been popular with special education teachers working in resource rooms where individualized learning programs and a low student-teacher ratio make them more feasible (Safer & Allen, 1976). Approaches based on social rather than material reinforcement are less cumbersome, but they have problems of their own. For one thing, a single teacher working with a class of 30 students will not be able to even keep track of, let alone systematically reinforce, all of the desirable behaviors of each individual student (Emery & Marholin, 1977). Secondly, praise and other forms of social reinforcement by teachers do not have powerful effects on most students, at least after the first grade or two in school. Thirdly, the "praise and ignore" formula so often recommended to teachers as a method of shaping desirable behavior has inherent drawbacks that limit its effectiveness in classroom situations. Praising the desirable behavior of classmates is a less efficient method of shaping the behavior of the target student than more direct instruction or cuing would be. Furthermore, ignoring undesirable behavior will have the effect of

extinguishing it only if the behavior is being reinforced by teacher attention. This is probably true of only a small minority of the undesirable behaviors that students display, and even where it is true, ignoring the problem may lead to escalation in intensity or spread to other students, as Kounin (1970) has shown. Thus, the principles of extinction through ignoring and of shaping behavior through vicarious reinforcement delivered to the peers of the target student cannot be applied often in the ordinary classroom, and certainly cannot be used as the basis for a systematic approach to classroom management.

Reinforcement can be used efficiently to shape behavior when it is applied directly to the target student and delivered as a consequence of the performance of desired behavior (at least to some degree; it has become clear that the reinforcers under the control of most teachers are numerous but weak, so that certain behaviors by certain students cannot literally be controlled by teacher-administered reinforcement). Although this can bring about desired behavior and even academic performance, it does so through processes of extrinsic reinforcement, which may reduce the degree to which students find working on or completing school tasks to be intrinsically rewarding (Lepper & Greene, 1978). The degree to which this is likely to occur depends on the degree to which students are led to believe that they are performing solely to obtain the extrinsic rewards, and not because the performance is inherently satisfying or involves the acquisition or exercise of valued skills. Thus, the motivational effect of controlling students' behavior

through reinforcement will be determined by the meanings that the students are led to attribute to the reinforcement process. Drawing on the work of several attribution theorists, Brophy (1981) developed the guidelines shown in Figure 1 for using praise in ways that would not only shape students' behavior but encourage rather than discourage their development of associated intrinsic motivation. The same guidelines would apply to the use of any reinforcer, not just praise.

Notice that the principles summarized in Figure 1 stress teaching students how to think about their behavior rather than merely reinforcing it. They also stress the devlopment of self-monitoring and self control of behavior. These are representative of the general changes that have been introduced into applications of behavior modification to classrooms. For example, teachers desiring to shape student behavior through reinforcement are now being advised not merely to reinforce contingently, but to draw up a formal contract with the student in advance, specifying precisely the performance standards that must be attained to earn the promised rewards. This "contingency contracting" approach can be used to specify improvements in both conduct and academic performance. The technique allows teachers to individualize arrangements with separate students, and it places more emphasis on student self-control, self-management, and self-instruction, and less on one-to-one relationships between specific behaviors and specific rewards. Contracts can be helpful in dealing with students who are poorly motivated, easily distracted, or resistant to school work

EFFECTIVE PRAISE	INEFFECTIVE PRAISE
1. is delivered contingently.	1. is delivered randomly or unsystematically
2. specifies the particulars of the accomplishment	2. is restricted to global positive reactions.
3. shows spontaneity, variety, and other signs of credibility; suggests clear attention to the student's accomplishment.	3. shows a bland uniformity which suggests a conditioned response made with minimal attention.
4. rewards attainment of specified performance criteria (which can include effort critieria, however).	4. rewards mere participation, without consideration of performance processes or outcomes.
5. provides information to students about their competence or the value of their accomplishments.	5. provides no information at all or gives students information about their status.
6. orients students toward better appreciation of their own task-related behavior and thinking about problem solving.	6. orients students toward comparing themselves with others and thinking about competing.
7. uses students' own prior accomplishments as the context for describing present accomplishments.	7. uses the accomplishments of peers as the context for describing students' present accomplishments.
8. is given in recognition of noteworthy effort or success at difficult (for this student) tasks.	8. is given without regard to the effort expended or the meaning of the accomplishment (for this student).
9. attributes success to effort and ability, implying that similar successes can be expected in the future.	9. attributes success to ability alone or to external factors such as luck or (easy) task difficulty.
10. fosters endogenous attributions (students believe that they expend effort on the task because they enjoy the task and/or want to develop task-relevant skills).	10. fosters exogenous attributions (students believe that they expend effort on the task for external reasons -- to please the teacher, win a competition or reward, etc.).
11. focuses students' attention on their own task-relevant behavior.	11. focuses students' attention on the teacher as an external authority figure who is manipulating them.
12. fosters appreciation of, and desirable attributions about, task relevant behavior after the process is completed.	12. intrudes into the ongoing process, distracting attention from task relevant behavior.

Figure 1. Guidelines for effective praise.[3]

[3] From Brophy, Jere E., "Teacher Praise: A Functional Analysis." Review of of Educational Research, Spring 1981, pp. 5-32. Copyright 1981, American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C.

or the teacher.

Experience with some of the elements involved in contingency contracting, such as goal setting and self-monitoring of behavior, led to the realization that these elements can have important positive effects of their own, independent of reinforcement. For example, inducing students to set goals for themselves can lead to performance increases, especially if those goals are specific and difficult rather than vague or too easy (Rosswork, 1977). Apparently, engaging in the process of setting goals not only provides students with specific objectives to pursue, but leads them to concentrate their efforts and monitor their performance more closely. The process does not work always or automatically, however. Sagotsky, Patterson, and Lepper (1978) found that exposure to goal setting procedures had no significant effect on students' study behavior or academic achievement, largely because many of the students did not follow through by actually using the goal setting procedures they had been shown.

That same study did show the effectiveness of self monitoring procedures, however. Students taught to monitor and maintain daily records of their own study behavior did show significant increases in both the study behavior and tested achievement (Sagotsky, Patterson, & Lepper, 1978). This was but one of many studies illustrating the effectiveness of procedures designed to help students monitor their own classroom behavior more closely and control it more effectively (Glynn, Thomas, & Shee, 1973; McLaughlin, 1976; O'Leary & Dubey, 1979; Rosenbaum & Drabman, 1979). These procedures, based on developing self control in students, have two

potential advantages over earlier procedures that depended on external control by the teacher (to the extent that they are implemented successfully). First, as noted previously, reinforcement-oriented approaches to classroom management that depend on the teacher as the dispenser of reinforcement are impractical in the typical classroom, in which a single teacher must deal with 30 students. Even the most skillful and determined teacher cannot continuously monitor all of the students and reinforce all of them appropriately. When responsibility for monitoring (and perhaps reinforcing) performance is shifted from the teacher to the students, this bottleneck is removed. Second, to the extent that teachers are successful in using behavior modification methods to shape student behavior, the effects depend upon the presence and activity of the teacher and thus do not generalize to other settings nor persist beyond the term or school year. Again, to the extent that students can learn to monitor and control their own behavior in school, they may also be able to generalize and apply these self control skills in other classrooms or even in non-school settings.

Self control skills are typically taught to students using a variety of recently developed procedures that Meichenbaum (1977) has called "cognitive behavior modification." One such technique combines modeling with verbalized self instructions. Rather than just tell students what to do, the model (teacher) demonstrates the process. The demonstration includes not only the physical

motions involved, but verbalization of the thoughts and other self-talk (self-instructions, self-monitoring, self-reinforcement) that would accompany the physical motions involved in doing the task. For example, Meichenbaum and Goodman (1971) used the technique with cognitively impulsive students who made many errors on a matching-to-sample task because they would respond too quickly, settling on the first response alternative that looked correct rather than taking time to examine all of the response alternatives before selecting the best one. Earlier studies had shown that simply telling these students to take their time, or even requiring them to inhibit their response for a specified delay period, did not improve their performance because the students did not use this time to examine the available alternatives. They simply waited until the time period was up. However, the technique of modeling with verbalized self instructions stressed the importance of carefully observing each alternative. As the models "thought out loud" while demonstrating the task, they made a point of resisting the temptation to settle on an alternative that looked correct before examining all of the rest, reminded themselves that one can be fooled by small differences in detail that are not noticed at first, and so on. This approach was successful in improving performance on the task, because the students learned to carefully compare each alternative with the model before selecting their response. Rather than merely imposing a delay on their speed of response, the treatment presented them with a strategy for responding to the task successfully,

and presented this strategy in a form that the students could easily understand and apply themselves.

Modeling combined with verbalized self instructions (as well as various related role play approaches) can be helpful with a great variety of student problems. Meichenbaum (1977) describes five stages to this approach: 1) an adult models a task while speaking aloud (cognitive modeling); 2) the child performs the task under the model's instruction (overt, external guidance); 3) the child performs the task while verbalizing self instructions aloud (overt self guidance); 4) the child whispers self instructions while doing the task (faded overt self guidance); 5) the child performs the task under self guidance via private speech (covert self instruction). Variations of this approach have been used not only to teach cognitively impulsive children to approach tasks more effectively, but also to help social isolates learn to initiate activities with their peers, to teach the students to be more creative in problem solving, to help aggressive students learn to control their anger and respond more effectively to frustration, and to help frustrated and defeated students to learn to cope with failure and respond to mistakes with problem solving efforts rather than withdrawal or resignation.

Recent applications include the "turtle" technique of Robin, Schneider, and Dolnick (1976), in which teachers teach impulsive and aggressive students to assume the "turtle" position when upset. The students learn to place their heads on their desks, close their eyes, and clench their fists. This gives them an immediate response

to use in anger provoking situations, and buys time that enables them to delay inappropriate behavior and think about constructive solutions to the problem. The "turtle" position is actually not essential; the key is training children to delay impulsive responding while they gradually relax and think about constructive alternatives. However, it is a gimmick that many younger students find enjoyable, and may also serve as a sort of crutch to certain children who might otherwise not be able to delay successfully.

Similarly, the "Think Aloud" program of Camp and Bash (1981) is designed to teach children to use their cognitive skills to guide their social behavior and to learn to cope with social problems. It is especially useful with students in the early grades, especially those prone to paranoid interpretations of peers' behavior or aggressive acting out as a response to frustration. In general, although generalization of skills taught through cognitive interventions has not yet been demonstrated convincingly (Pressley, 1979), approaches featuring modeling, verbalized self instructions, and other aspects of self monitoring and self control training appear to be very promising for use in classrooms, both as instructional techniques for students in general and as remediation techniques for students with emotional or behavioral problems (McLaughlin, 1976; O'Leary & Dubey, 1979; Rosenbaum & Drabman, 1979).

Individual Counseling and Therapy

In addition to behavior modification techniques, a variety of techniques developed by counselors and psychotherapists have been recommended for use by teachers with students who have

chronic personal or behavioral problems. Early on, many of these approaches stressed psychoanalytic or other "depth" interpretation of behavior and treatment through methods such as free association or acting out of impulses against substitute objects to achieve catharsis or gratification. Many of these early theories have proven unnecessary or incorrect, and the early treatment methods have proven ineffective or unfeasible for consistent use by most teachers.

More recently, however, therapy-based suggestions to teachers have shifted concern from unconscious motivations to overt behaviors, from long term general treatment toward briefer crisis intervention, and from viewing disturbed students as "sick" toward viewing them as needing information or insight that will allow them to understand themselves better and achieve better control over their emotions and behavior. As a result, these therapy-based notions have become more compatible with one another and with the cognitive behavior modification approaches described above. Suggestions from different sources are mostly complementary rather than contradictory, and taken together they provide the basis for systematic approaches to counseling problem students.

Dreikurs (1968) sees disturbed students as reacting to their own feelings of discouragement or inferiority by developing defense mechanisms designed to protect self esteem. He believes that students who do not work out satisfactory personal and group adjustments at school will display symptoms related to seeking after one of the following goals (listed in increasing order of disturbance):

attention, power, revenge, or display of inferiority. He then suggests how teachers can determine the purpose of student symptoms by analyzing the goals that the students seem to be pursuing and the effects that the students' behavior seems to be having on the teacher, and also suggests ways that teachers can use this information to help students eliminate their need to continue such behavior.

Morse (1971) describes the "life space interview," in which teachers work together with students until each understands troublesome incidents and their meanings to the student, and until ways to prevent repetition of the problem are identified. During these interviews, the teacher lets the students get things off their chests and makes an effort to appreciate the students' perceptions and beliefs, but at the same time forces the students to confront unpleasant realities, tries to help the students develop new or deeper insights, and, following emotional catharsis and problem analysis, seeks to find mutually agreed upon solutions.

Good and Brophy (1978, 1980) present similar advice about maintaining a neutral but solution-oriented stance in dealing with student conflict, conducting investigations in ways that are likely to obtain the desired information and avoid escalating the conflict, negotiating agreements about proposed solutions, obtaining commitment, and promoting growth through modeling and communication of positive expectations.

Gordon (1974) discusses the need to analyze the degree to which parties to a conflict "own" the problem. The problem is owned by

the teacher but not the student if only the teacher's needs are being frustrated (as when a student persistently disrupts class by socializing with friends). Conversely, the student owns the problem when the student's needs are being frustrated (such as when a student is rejected by the peer group through no fault of the teacher). Finally, teachers and students share problems in situations where each is frustrating the needs of the other. Gordon believes that student owned problems call for a generally sympathetic and helpful stance, and in particular, an attempt to understand and clarify the student's problem through "active listening." During active listening, the teacher not only listens carefully to the student's message, tries to understand it from the student's point of view, and reflects it back accurately to the student, but also listens for the personal feelings and reactions of the student to the events being described, and reflects understanding of these to the student, as well. When the teacher owns the problem, it is necessary for the teacher to communicate the problem to the student, using "I" messages which state explicitly the linkages between the student's problem behavior, the problem that the behavior causes the teacher (how it frustrates the teacher's needs), and the effects of these events on the teacher's feelings (discouragement, frustration). The idea here is to minimize blame and ventilation of anger, and to get the student not only to recognize the problem behavior itself but to see its effects on the teacher.

Gordon believes that active listening and "I" messages will

help teachers and students to achieve shared rational views of problems, and help them to assume a cooperative, problem solving attitude. To the extent that conflicts are involved, he recommends a "no lose" method of finding the solution that will work best for all concerned. The six steps in the process are: define the problem; generate possible solutions; evaluate those solutions; decide which is best; determine how to implement this decision; and assess how well the solution is working later (with negotiation of the new agreement if the solution is not working satisfactorily to all concerned).

Glasser (1969, 1977) has suggested applications of what he calls "reality therapy" to teachers, providing guidelines for both general classroom management and problem solving with individual students. The title of his book, Schools Without Failure (Glasser, 1969) illustrates his interest in a facilitative atmosphere in the school at large, and not just in individual teacher-student relationships. In that book he advocated that classroom meetings be used for teachers and students to jointly establish classroom rules, adjust these rules, develop new ones when needed, and deal with problems. This part of his approach is not as well accepted as his later suggestions, because many teachers oppose student self government on principle, and others find it overly cumbersome and time consuming. Also, it can involve exposure of vulnerable individuals to public scrutiny and pressure, violation of confidences, and other ethical problems.

More recently, Glasser (1977) has advanced what he calls his

"ten steps to good discipline," which he describes as a constructive and nonpunitive but no-nonsense approach. It is predicated on the beliefs that: students are and will be held responsible for their in-school behavior; rules are reasonable and fairly administered; and teachers maintain a positive, problem solving stance in dealing with students.

Glasser's ten-step approach is intended for use with students who have not responded to generally effective classroom management (thus, like other techniques described in this section, it is a supplement to the general principles described earlier in the paper, and not a starting place or basis for managing the class as a whole). Each consecutive step escalates the seriousness of the problem, and thus should not be implemented lightly. The ten steps are as follows:

1. Select a student for concentrated attention and list typical reactions to the student's disruptive behavior.

2. Analyze the list to see what techniques do and do not work, and resolve not to repeat the ones that do not work.

3. Improve personal relationships with the student by providing extra encouragement, asking the student to perform special errands, showing concern, implying that things will improve, and so on.

4. Focus the student's attention on the disruptive behavior by requiring the student to describe what he or she has been doing. Continue until the student describes the behavior accurately, and then request that he or she stop it.

5. Call a short conference, again have the student describe the behavior, and also state whether or not it is against the rules or recognized expectations. Then ask the student what he or she should be doing instead.

6. Repeat step five, but this time add that a plan will be needed to solve the problem. The plan will be more than a simple agreement to stop misbehaving, because this has

not been honored in the past. The negotiated plan must include the student's commitment to positive actions designed to eliminate the problem.

7. Isolate the student or use time out procedures. During these periods of isolation, the student will be charged with devising his or her own plan for ensuring following of the rules in the future. Isolation will continue until the student has devised such a plan, gotten it approved by the teacher, and made a commitment to follow it.

8. If this does not work, the next step is in-school suspension. Now the student must deal with the principal or someone other than the teacher, but this other person will repeat earlier steps in the sequence and press the student to come up with a plan that is acceptable. It is made clear that the student will either return to class and follow reasonable rules in effect there, or continue to be isolated outside of class.

9. If students remain out of control or in in-school suspension, their parents are called to take them home for the day, and the process is repeated starting the next day.

10. Students who do not respond to the previous steps are removed from school and referred to another agency.

There is little systematic research available on the strategies described in this section. Survey data reported by Glasser (1977) indicate that implementation of his program has been associated with reductions in referral to the office, fighting, and suspensions, but neither his program nor any of the others described here has yet been evaluated systematically to the degree that behavior modification approaches have been evaluated. In part, this is because many of these approaches are new, so that many teachers have not yet heard of them and very few have received specific training in them.

This was shown clearly in a study by Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981), who observed and interviewed 44 teachers working in the inner-city schools of a large metropolitan school system and 54

teachers working in more heterogeneous schools in a smaller city. All of the teachers had had at least three years of experience (most had 10 years or more). Half were nominated by their principals as outstanding at dealing with problem students, and half as average in this regard.

Few of these teachers had had significant preservice or in-service training in how to manage classrooms or cope with problem students, so most of them had to learn from other teachers and from their own experience. Although many were quite successful, many were not, and even most of those who were successful relied on an unsystematic "bag of tricks" approach developed through experience and had problems articulating exactly what they did and why they did it. Gordon's notion of problem ownership proved useful in predicting the responses of these teachers to various classroom problems, in that most teachers responded with sympathy and attempts to help students who presented student owned problems but reacted unsympathetically and often punitively to students who presented teacher owned problems. Few teachers were aware of the term "problem ownership" or of Gordon's suggestions for handling classroom conflicts, however, and none used the problem ownership concept in conjunction with the problem solving methods that Gordon suggests.

Teachers' responses to interviews about general strategies for dealing with various types of problem students, along with their specific descriptions of how they would respond to vignettes depicting problems that such students typically cause in the classroom, did show some consistent correlations with principals' and observers' ratings of teacher effectiveness at dealing with problem students.

One basic factor was willingness to assume responsibility. Teachers rated as effective made some attempt to deal with the problem personally, whereas teachers rated ineffective often disclaimed responsibility or competence to deal with the problem and attempted to refer it to the principal or someone else (counselor, social worker, etc.). Effective teachers often involved these other professionals as part of their attempt to deal with the problem, but they remained involved personally and did not try to turn over the entire problem to others, as the ineffective teachers did.

The second general difference was that the effective teachers used long term, solution-oriented approaches to problems, whereas the ineffective teachers stressed short term desist/control responses. Effective teachers would check to see if symptomatic behavior was being caused by underlying personal problems (including home problems), and if so, what might be done about these underlying problems. If they suspected that students were acting impulsively or lacked sufficient awareness of their own behavior and its effects on others, they would call for socialization of these students designed to provide them with needed information and insights. If they were behavioristically oriented, they would consider offering incentives, negotiating contracts, or devising other ways to call attention to and reinforce desirable behavior. If they were more insight oriented, they would call for spending time with problem students individually, attempting to instruct and inform them, getting to know them better personally, and fostering insight with techniques much like Gordon's active listening. If they had more of a self concept/personal adjustment orientation, they would

speak of encouraging discouraged students, building self esteem by arranging for and calling attention to success experiences, improving peer relationships, and so on. All of these various approaches or approaches limited to controlling troublesome behavior in the immediate situation without attempting to deal with larger underlying problems. None of the apparently effective approaches, however, seemed clearly superior to the others in every respect. In fact, a follow up study (Rohrkemper, Note 3) comparing teachers who used behavior modification approaches successfully with teachers who used induction (insight oriented) approaches successfully suggested that each approach has its own (desirable) effects, so that a combined approach would be better than an emphasis on one to the exclusion of the other.

Context Differences

So far, this paper has been written as if principles of effective classroom organization and management were identical for all teachers and settings. To an extent, this is true. Advanced planning and preparation, clarity about rules, routines, and procedures, care in installing these at the beginning of the year and following up thereafter, and regular use of the group management techniques described by Kounin (integrated with an effective instructional program) are important in any classroom. So is the teacher's willingness to assume responsibility for exercising authority and socializing students by communicating expectations, providing instruction, stimulating insight, helping students to set and pursue goals, resolving conflicts, and solving problems. A great deal of classroom-based research is available to guide

teachers in developing many of these skills, and a consensus of opinion is available to support most of the rest. Thus, an internally consistent, mutually supportive collection of ideas and techniques is now available for training teachers in effective classroom management.

There still is much room for individual differences, however. For example, although it is important that students have a clear understanding about classroom rules and expectations, teachers can follow their own preferences about how these rules are determined (on a continuum from teacher as the sole authority who propounds the rules to the students to a democratic approach in which rules are adopted by majority vote at class meetings). Similarly, classrooms can be managed quite nicely without reliance on contingent reinforcement, but there is no reason that teachers who enjoy or believe in rewarding their students for good performance should not do so (although the principles outlined in Figure 1 should be kept in mind). As another example, it seems to be important that students have clear options available to them when they finish their assigned work, and that they learn to follow expectations concerning these options, but what these options are will be determined mostly by teacher preferences and beliefs about what is important (options may all require staying in seat or may involve moving to various learning or enrichment centers, for example, and options may differ in the degree to which they are required vs. optional or subject matter related vs. recreational).

In addition to these differences relating to teacher preference, there will be differences in what is appropriate for different

classes of students. Brophy and Evertson (1978) identified four general stages of student intellectual and social development that have implications for classroom management:

Stage One (kindergarten-grade 2 or 3). Most children are compliant and oriented toward conforming to and pleasing their teachers, but they need to be socialized into the student role. They require a great deal of formal instruction, not only in rules and expectations, but in classroom procedures and routines.

Stage Two (grades 2-3 through grades 5-6). Students have learned most of what they need to know about school rules and routines, and most remain oriented toward obeying and pleasing their teachers. Consequently, less time needs to be devoted to classroom management at the beginning of the year, and less cuing, reminding, and instructing is required thereafter.

Stage Three (grades 5-6 through grades 9-10). Students enter adolescence and become less oriented toward pleasing teachers and more oriented toward pleasing peers. Many become resentful or at least questioning of authority, and disruptions due to attention seeking, humorous remarks, and adolescent horseplay become common. Classroom management once again becomes more time consuming, but in contrast to Stage One, the task facing teachers is not so much one of instructing willing but of ignoring students about what to do as it is motivating or controlling students who know what to do but are not always willing to do it. Also, individual counseling becomes more prominent, as the relative quiet and stability that most students show in the middle grades gives way to the adjustment problems of adolescence.

Stage Four (after grades 9-10). Most students become more personally settled and more oriented toward academic learning again. As in Stage Two, classroom management requires less teacher time and trouble, and classrooms take on a more businesslike, academic focus.

Note that these grade level differences in classroom management are more in how much effort is needed and in degree of emphasis given to various classroom management tasks, and not in the underlying principles. This seems to be the case with regard to other individual and group differences in students, as well. At any given grade level, the same basic classroom management principles and strategies seem to apply for boys as well as girls, blacks as well as whites, and for students of various ethnic and social class groups. Physically handicapped students being mainstreamed into regular classrooms may require special arrangements or assistance (see Chapter 24 in Good and Brophy, 1980), but this will be in addition to rather than instead of the principles described here. Similarly, these principles apply as well to students labeled emotionally disturbed as to other students (Kounin & Obradovic, 1968), although the disturbed students may need more individualized attention and closer monitoring.

Within limits, some adaptation to local expectations or common practice is appropriate. For example, middle class teachers typically expect students to maintain eye contact with them during disciplinary contacts, as a sign of both attention and respect.

However, individuals in certain minority groups are taught to avert their eyes in such situations, and for them, maintaining eye contact may even connote defiance. Obviously, it is important for teachers working with such individuals to be aware of these cultural differences so as to be able to interpret their students' behavior correctly and respond to it appropriately. Similarly, such teachers need to be especially sensitive about avoiding unnecessary conflicts between themselves and their students. For example, student monitor roles should be confined to those that will not place students in conflict with the peer group, and appointments to peer leadership positions will require the involvement or at least the support of the existing peer leaders (Roberts, 1970; Riessman, 1962). In general, it seems important for teachers of any background and in any setting to be openminded and tolerant in dealing with students who come from very different social or cultural backgrounds.

This does not necessarily mean catering to student preferences or automatically reinforcing their expectations, however. For example, middle class teachers accustomed to forbidding violence in connection with conflicts and forbidding language that they consider to be obscene tend to become noticeably more tolerant of these behaviors if they are assigned to work with lower-class students presumably in deference to local mores (Weiss & Weiss, Note 4). Yet, Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Weisbaker (1979) have shown that schools which are most effective with lower-class students are those that propound and enforce standards for conduct and academic performance, and interviews with students regularly

reveal that they are concerned about safety and that they expect and desire their teachers to enforce standards of conduct in the classroom (Metz, 1978; Nash, 1976). Thus, certain behavior should not be accepted even if it is common in the area in which the school is located.

As another example, many students of low socioeconomic status are accustomed to authoritarian or even brutal treatment at home, but this is not what they need from their teachers. If anything, these students have a greater need for, and respond more positively to, teacher acceptance and warmth (Brophy & Evertson, 1976). Specifically in the case of minority group students who are alienated from school learning and discriminated against by the majority of the student body, successful teaching involves a combination of warmth with determination in demanding achievement efforts and enforcing conduct limits (Kleinfeld, 1975).

In general, then, the overall goals of classroom management for various categories of special students will be the same as they are for more typical students, although the specific methods used to accomplish these goals may differ somewhat. Distractible students may need study carrels or other quiet places to work, very slow students may need special tutoring and opportunities to get more frequent and personal help from the teacher; and poor workers may need contracts or other approaches that provide a record of progress, break tasks into smaller segments, or provide for more individualized reinforcement.

Conclusion

A comprehensive approach to classroom management must include attention to relevant student characteristics and individual differences, preparation of the classroom as an effective learning environment, organization of instruction and support activities to maximize student engagement in productive tasks, development of a workable set of housekeeping procedures and conduct rules, techniques of group management during active instruction, techniques of motivating and shaping desired behavior, techniques of resolving conflict and dealing with students' personal adjustment problems, and orchestration of all these elements into an internally consistent and effective system. Clearly, no single source or approach treats all of these elements comprehensively.

However, the elements for a systematic approach to classroom management can be gleaned from various sources (particularly recent and research-based sources) that provide complementary suggestions. The research of Kounin and his colleagues and of Evertson, Emmer, Anderson, and their colleagues has provided extremely detailed information on how teachers can organize their classrooms, launch the year, and manage the classrooms on an everyday basis. There is less research support for suggestions about counseling individual students and resolving conflicts, but the approaches of cognitive behavior modifiers, Dreikurs, Glasser, Good and Brophy, Gordon, and Morse, among others, implicitly agree on a common set of principles. These include respect for student individuality and tolerance for individual differences, willingness

to try to understand and assist students with special needs or problems, reliance on instruction and persuasion rather than power assertion, and humanistic values generally. However, they also recognize that students have responsibilities along with their rights, and that they will have to suffer the consequences if they persist in failing to fulfill those responsibilities. These ideas appear to mesh nicely with the evolving role of the teacher as a professional with particular expertise and specific but limited responsibilities to students and their parents, and with certain rights as the instructional leaders and authority figures in the classroom.

Reference Notes

1. Emmer, E., & Evertson, C. Effective management at the beginning of the school year in junior high classes (Report No. 6107). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1980.

2. Evertson, C., Emmer, E., Clements, B., Sanford, J., Worsham, M., & Williams, E. Organizing and managing the elementary school classroom. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1981.

3. Rohrkemper, M. Classroom perspectives study: An investigation of differential perceptions of classroom events. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1981.

4. Weiss, M., & Weiss, P. Taking another look at teaching: How lower class children influence middle-class teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 137223)

References

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Brophy, J. An experiemental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 1979, 79, 193-223.

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Emmer, E. Dimensions in classroom management derived from recent research. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1980, 12, 343-356.

Arlin, M. Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 1979, 16, 42-56.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. The jigsaw classroom. Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1978.

Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference. New York: Bergin, 1979.

Brophy, J. Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 733-750.

Brophy, J. Teacher praise: A functional analysis. Review of Educational Research, 1981, 51, 5-32.

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. Context variables in teaching. Educational Psychologist, 1978, 12, 310-316.

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.

Brophy, J., & Putnam, J. Classroom management in the elementary grades. In D. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management. The 78th yearbook of the national society for the study of education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Brophy, J., & Rohrkemper, M. The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1981, 73, 295-311.

Camp, B., & Bash, M. Think aloud: Increasing social and cognitive skills--A problem-solving program for children, primary level. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1981.

Cartledge, G., & Milburn, J. The case for teaching social skills in the classroom: A review. Review of Educational Research, 1978, 48, 133-156.

Dreikurs, R. Psychology in the classroom: A manual for teachers (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Emery, R., & Marholin, D. An applied behavior analysis of delinquency: The irrelevancy of relevant behavior. American Psychologist, 1977, 32, 860-873.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. Effective management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 1980, 80, 219-231.

Fisher, C., Berliner, D., Filby, N., Marliave, R., Cahen, L., & Dishaw, M. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time, and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham and A. Lieberman (Eds.), Time to learn. Washington, D.C. National Institute of Education, 1980.

Gambrell, L., Wilson, R., & Gantt, W. Classroom observations of task-attending behaviors of good and poor readers. Journal of Educational Research, 1981, 74, 400-405.

Glasser, W. Schools without failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Glasser, W. Ten steps to good discipline. Today's Education, 1977, 66, 4 (November-December), 61-63.

Glynn, E., Thomas, J., & Shee, S. Behavioral self-control of on-task behavior in an elementary classroom. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1973, 6, 105-113.

Good, T. Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school: What we know about it now. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 52-64.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. Looking in classrooms (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. Educational psychology: A realistic approach (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1980.

Good, T., & Grouws, D. Teaching effects: A process-product study in fourth-grade mathematics classrooms. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 49-54.

Gordon, T. T.E.T. Teacher effectiveness training. New York: David McKay, 1974.

Jorgenson, G. Relationship of classroom behavior to the accuracy of the match between material difficulty and student ability. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 24-32.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. Learning together and alone. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Kazdin, A. The token economy: A review and evaluation. New York: Plenum, 1977.

Kleinfeld, J. Effective teachers of Indian and Eskimo students. School Review, 1975, 83, 301-344

Kounin, J. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Kounin, J., & Obradovic, S. Managing emotionally disturbed children in regular classrooms: A replication and extension. Journal of Special Education, 1968, 2, 129-135.

Krumboltz, J., & Krumboltz, H. Changing children's behavior. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Lepper, M., & Greene, D. (Eds.), The hidden costs of reward: New perspectives on the psychology of human motivation. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 1978.

McLaughlin, T.F. Self-control in the classroom. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 631-663.

Meichenbaum, D. Cognitive-behavior modification. New York: Plenum, 1977.

Meichenbaum, D., & Goodman, J. Training impulsive children to talk to themselves. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 77, 115-126.

Metz, M. Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1978.

Morse, W. Worksheet on life space interviewing for teachers. In N. Long, W. Morse, and R. Newman (Eds.), Conflict in the classroom: The education of children with problems (2nd ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1971.

Moskowitz, G., & Hayman, M. Success strategies of inner-city teachers: A year-long study. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69, 283-389.

Nash, B. The effects of classroom spatial organisation on four-and-five-year-old children's learning. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1981, 51, 144-155.

Nash, R. Pupils' expectations of their teachers. In M. Stubbs and S. Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in classroom observation. New York: Wiley, 1976.

O'Leary, S., & Dubey, D. Applications of self-control procedures by children: A review. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1979, 12, 449-465.

O'Leary, K., & O'Leary, S. (Eds.), Classroom management: The successful use of behavior modification (2nd ed.). New York: Pergamon, 1977.

Pressley, M. Increasing children's self-control through cognitive interventions. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 319-370.

Riessman, F. The culturally deprived child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Roberts, J. Scene of the battle: Group behavior in urban classrooms. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Robin, A., Schneider, M., & Dolnick, M. The turtle technique: An extended case study of self-control in the classroom. Psychology in the Schools, 1976, 13, 449-453.

Rosenbaum, M., & Drabman, R. Self-control training in the classroom: A review and critique. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1979, 12, 467-485.

Rosenshine, B., & Berliner, D. Academic engaged time. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 4, 3-16.

Rosswork, S. Goal-setting: The effects on an academic task with varying magnitudes of incentive. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 710-715.

Safer, D., & Allen, R. Hyperactive children: Diagnosis and management. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1976.

Sagotsky, G., Patterson, C., & Lepper, M. Training children's self-control: A field experiment in self-monitoring and goal-setting in the classroom. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1978, 25, 242-253.

Sanford, J., & Evertson, C. Classroom management in a low SES junior high: Three case studies. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32, 34-38.

Sharan, S. Cooperative learning in small groups: Recent methods and effects on achievement, attitudes, and ethnic relations. Review of Educational Research, 1980, 50, 241-271.

Slavin, R. Cooperative learning. Review of Educational Research, 1980, 50, 315-342.

Stanford, G. Developing effective classroom groups: A practical guide for teachers. New York: Hart, 1977.

Thompson, M., Brassell, W., Persons, S., Tucker, R., & Rollins, H. Contingency management in the schools: How often and how well does it work? American Educational Research Journal, 1974, 11, 19-28.

Webb, N. A process-outcome analysis of learning in group and individual settings. Educational Psychologist, 1980, 15, 69-83.